

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,456	03/31/2004	Qi Lu	017887-010510US	8402

20350 7590 09/21/2004

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER	
VEILLARD, JACQUES	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2175	

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/816,456	LU, QI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jacques Veillard	2175	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 March 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the applicant's communication filed on 3/31/2004.

2. Claims 1-12 are pending and presented for examination.

3. Claims 1, 4, and 10 are the independent claims. Other claims are the dependent.

Priority

4. Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) over the U.S Application SN 60/460,653 filed on 4/4/2003 is acknowledged.

Drawings

5. The informal drawings filed in this application are acceptable for examination purposes. When the application is allowed, applicant will be required to submit new formal drawings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones. (U. S. Pat. No. 6,256,623) in view of Meadway et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 6,675,205).

As per claim 1, Jones teaches, "a network search access construct for accessing web-based search services" by providing a search clips for information on networks and more specifically to a computerized system for and method of accessing information from web-based

search services (See Jones Title, Abstract and col.1, lines 19-22). Jones does not teach the system for receiving a request for specific host content; obtaining the host content; formulating a search query based on the host content; applying the search query to a search engine to search guest content; and including at least a reference to at least some of the search query results with the host content returned in response to the request.

However, Meadway et al., on the other hand, teaches a service on a computer network for performing centralized searches based on index information (See Meadway et al. Abstract) includes the features of: receiving a request for specific host content (See Meadway col.1, lines 33-37 and col.2, lines 38-44); obtaining the host content (See Meadway et la. col.1, lines 54-59); formulating a search query based on the host content (See Meadway et la. col.3, lines 35-40 and col.6, lines 16-28); applying the search query to a search engine to search guest content (See Meadway et al. col.7, lines 38-67; and including at least a reference to at least some of the search query results with the host content returned in response to the request (See Meadway et al. col.8, lines 1-27).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Jones by incorporating the peer-to-peer automated system taught by Meadway et al.. The motivation being to have enhanced the system of Jones by allowing it to receive a request for a specific host more efficiently; thus providing an intuitive, easy-to-use, icon-based interface that enables user to search for information and retrieve files quickly and efficiently (See Meadway Abstract).

As per claim 2, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, the

combination of Jones and Meadway, as modified, teaches the claimed limitations "wherein a host content summary is used as the search query" (See Jones col.4, lines 1-38).

As per claim 3, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, the combination of Jones and Meadway, as modified, teaches the claimed limitations "wherein the host content is requested from a user system via an HTTP request including a URL referencing the host content, wherein the search query is a string of one or more keywords to which the host content relates, and wherein the guest query comprises one or more of advertisements, potentially related content references and context-specific page features"(See Meadway et al. col.16, lines 1-62).

8. Claims 4-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones. (U. S. Pat. No. 6,256,623) and Meadway et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 6,675,205) in view of Agrawal et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 6,233,575).

As per claim 4, Meadway et al. teaches a peer-to-peer automated service system on a computer network of generating content for an electronic content access system wherein requests for host content are received and responses to such requests include at least references to the host content requested and at least references to guest content related to the host content requested (See Meadway et al. Abstract, col.1, lines 33-37 and col.2, lines 38-44). Similarly, the system taught by Meadway et al. comprising: obtaining host content from sources external to the electronic content access system; importing the obtained host content to a host content database

(See Meadway et la. col.1, lines 54-59). Meadway et al. did not specifically teach associating at least some of the host content with terms in a host content dictionary; such that a query using host content summary data for requested host content can be applied as a search against the guest content to retrieve guest content related to the requested host content without requiring that each host content object have a preassociated link with guest content to be provided in response to the request for host content.

However, Jones teaches a network search access construct for accessing web-based search services including the features of associating at least some of the host content with terms in a host content dictionary (See Jones Figs. 3 and 4, "Jones achieved this claimed limitations by identifying words or phrases that are understood and specific to the area shown in figs. 3 and 4"); such that a query using host content summary data for requested host content can be applied as a search against the guest content to retrieve guest content related to the requested host content without requiring that each host content object have a preassociated link with guest content to be provided in response to the request for host content (See Jones col.4, lines 8-38, and col.7, line 27 through col.8, line 67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Meadway et al. with the network search teachings taught by Jones because Jones provides a template which allows services to quickly define search clips such that they have uniform characteristics.

It is noted, however, the combination of Meadway et al. and Jones did not specifically teach associating at least some of the host content with nodes of a host content taxonomy, wherein the host content taxonomy is a hierarchy of topics; distilling the host content to derive

host content summary data for the host content; storing the host content summary data in an indexable structure; and storing guest content in an indexable structure. On the other hand, Agrawal et al. achieved this claimed limitations by providing multilevel taxonomy for organizing a large text database into hierarchy of topics and for maintaining this organization as document (See Agrawal et al. Title, and Abstract, Fig.2, col.2, lines 6-26, col.9, line 51 through col.10, line 19, col.11, lines 3-15, lines 55-57, lines 60-62, col.12, lines 5-10, col.14, lines 50-61, and col.20, lines 19-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the combination teachings of Jones and Meadway et al by incorporating the taxonomy mechanism taught by Agrawal et al.. The motivation being to have enhanced the systems of Jones and Meadway et al. by allowing them to classify, organize and reorganize of a database of information more efficiently; providing an intuitive, easy-to-use, icon-based interface to present the user with a series of refined views of document collections in response to queries (See Agrawal et al. col.4, lines 29-42).

As per claim 10, the claim has substantially the same limitations as claim 4. These limitations have already been discussed in the rejection of claim 4. Therefore, it is rejected on similar grounds corresponding to the arguments given for the rejected claim 4 above.

As per claims 5 and 6, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 4. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 4 above. In addition, the combination of Jones, Meadway et al. and Agrawal et al., as modified, teaches the

claimed limitations "wherein the terms in the host content dictionary comprise one or more words and wherein at least some of the terms in the host content dictionary comprise more than one word, with the more than one word having an order among the words" (See Jones Figs 3, 4 and 5, col.4, lines 27-38, and col.8, lines 19-62).

As per claim 7, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 4. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 4 above. In addition, the combination of Jones, Meadway et al. and Agrawal et al., as modified, teaches the claimed limitations "wherein some host content is associated with more than one node of the host content taxonomy" (See Agrawal et al. Fig.2, and col.10, lines 59 through col.11, line 2).

As per claim 8, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 4. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 4 above. In addition, the combination of Jones, Meadway et al. and Agrawal et al., as modified, teaches the claimed limitations "wherein distilling uses the contents of the host content dictionary and host content taxonomy"(See Agrawal et al. col.11, lines 3-15, and col.12, lines 5-10).

As per claims 9 and 12, the combination of Jones, Meadway et al. and Agrawal et al., as modified, teaches the claimed limitations "wherein the host content summary data is usable as the search query to be applied against the guest content"(See Jones col.4, lines 1-38).

As per claim 11, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 10. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 10 above. In addition, the combination of Jones, Meadway et al. and Agrawal et al., as modified, teaches the claimed limitations "wherein the reference to the host content is a URI and the request is an HTTP page request"(See Meadway et al. col.16, lines 1-62).

Other Prior Art Made Of Record

9. Bartell et al. U. S. Pat. No. 5,625,767,
Cohen U. S. Pat. No. 6,263,352,
Doerre et al. U. S. Pat. No. 6,446,061,
Leight et al. U. S. Pat. No. 6,446,083,
Priest U. S. Pat. No. 5,829,002, and
Brady et al. U. S. Pat. No. 6,463,430.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

11. Any response to this action should be mail to:

Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239 (for formal communication intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 746-7240 (for informal of draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand - delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2021 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA, Fourth Floor Lobby (Receptionist Telephone No. (703) 305-3900).

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacques Veillard whose telephone number is (703) 305-7094. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 9:30 AM to 4: 30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached on (703) 305-3830. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 308-5403.

CHARLES RONES
PRIMARY EXAMINER

J. V

Jacques Veillard
Patent Examiner TC 2100

September 17, 2004